



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tional difficulties, some of which might have led to war. The Hague Conference of 1907 revealed that all the nations of the world are in favor of a genuine supreme court for the nations. The principle that investigation should precede action has found expression in thirty-one definite international treaties between the United States and foreign governments. Co-operation between American republics has given rise to what we hopefully call Pan Americanism. The definition of the Rights and Duties of Nations is a live topic of discussion among men of affairs. International organizations have multiplied rapidly, especially within the last generation. The Universal Postal Union, for instance, is an encouraging example of highly successful international co-operative effort. For nearly thirty years the Interparliamentary Union has shown the interest of statesmen in internationalism. The conferees will be especially familiar with the Geneva Tribunal which settled the Alabama Claims in 1872; with the Paris Tribunal, which settled the Seals Controversy in 1893, and with the Hague Tribunal, which settled the North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Dispute in 1910, a dispute which had lasted through three generations.

The point is that the makers of peace at the close of this war, following the principle that practical men proceed from the known to the unknown, will be confronted and helped by a world experience which the men behind the Holy Alliance and the Council of Vienna could not have profited by or foreseen.

Men have been able to organize their States in opposition to war heretofore. They have been able to preserve peace during critical years. As a result, they have been able to develop their industries, commerce, and educational institutions extensively. The feeling that nations are mutually dependent upon each other is stronger today than ever before. International law is, in consequence, more and more respected and appealed to. The old quadruple alliance following Chaumont, the quintuple alliance, the triple alliance, the entente, the concert of Europe have shown what groups of nations can do, and incidentally what they cannot do when arrayed against each other. The great hope for those opposed to war is that there may be a growing consciousness of its wrongs and injustice and a larger working faith in the principles of law and order.

Sir Rabindranath Tagore, now visiting in this country, which appeals to him as "a great laboratory in which are to be solved all the problems of the human race," recently remarked:

"The great purpose of the present age is that of bringing together all races into relations of mutual understanding and sympathy, of unifying men and nations into an harmonious whole.

"The observing traveler can see in all countries the great breaking down of barriers and prejudices that is taking place, and the insistent reaching out for broader spheres of thought and action. This is the greatest transition period in all history. For the first time humanity is awakening to a world consciousness. Writers and thinkers are breathing a freer atmosphere than ever before, and in men's minds there is a growing restlessness. It is as if the world is struggling to be born anew.

"This war is the inevitable friction resulting from

many nations coming in close contact for the first time. It is the world awakening. There is struggle, confusion, and darkness at first, but soon there will be unity, peace, and light."

CONCLUSION.

This statement of our real world problem, of some of the factors which enter into it, of the methods of solution suggested from various quarters, of the inadequacy of an international military force, and of the facts of a century of international endeavor, is offered with a full confidence that others, with greater knowledge and keener insight, will develop a more significant and helpful "estimate of the situation."

THE PRACTICABILITY OF ABOLISHING ARMAMENTS

By GUSTAV SPILLER, London

General Secretary, International Union of Ethical Societies

IN MY preceding article* I strove to demonstrate that the laudable suggestion of a mutual limitation of armaments was grounded on a serious fallacy. I reasoned there that the implements and methods of warfare were subject to such rapid and far-reaching changes that no treaty could comprise them. I instanced, in support of this contention, the appalling effects of the heavy guns at the beginning of the war, pounding "impregnable" fortresses into an amorphous mass in a few days; the long-range artillery to which no reply was possible; the fiendishly destructive nature of modern machine guns; the unexpected triumphs of the submarine; besides much else of equal importance. I might have also alluded to the altogether unparalleled and unanticipated prodigal expenditure of shells which has transformed belligerent countries into munition factories, as well as to the pre-war experiments with rays which were plausibly supposed to possess the power of exploding gunpowder magazines from an appreciable distance.

These and similar considerations compelled us to conclude that the proposal to limit armaments by mutual consent is an entirely unpractical one, and that, unless armaments be dispensed with altogether, the suicidal and fratricidal race for superior armaments will be indefinitely prolonged. Treaties cannot take cognizance of or suppress new inventions, and accordingly suspicion, hatred, rivalry, intrigues, crises, and wars must continue—even with much increased intensity—so long as armaments last.

"But," many persons object, "armaments cannot be abolished without producing international anarchy. There must be a physical sanction to international law, as there is one to national law. You might as well come forward with a project for disbanding the police as with one for the disbanding of armies. Only physical force will restrain most individuals and nations from criminal acts. What the police is to the individual, armies are to nations, and both are indispensable."

The speciousness of the argument has blinded most of us to the actual facts of the case. The analogy, that

*See page 270 of *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* for October.

is, is inadmissible: *individuals cannot be compared to States*. The true analogy points in the opposite direction. The State is a territorial unit, and should be, therefore, only compared to territorial units. So soon, however, as we do this, the pernicious fallacy becomes visible in all its glaringness and perversity. Towns are territorial units, and towns as spacious as Paris, London, and New York do not possess a *single* piece of cannon nor a *single* soldier. Yet not only do they live at peace with neighboring territorial units, but they are subject to law without ever needing to have physical force applied to them. This holds true, of course, of all types of territorial units up to sub-States. In these instances law rules without the aid of the sword. In the very unusual circumstances where obedience is refused, non-physical sanctions compel respect for the law.

The foundation thesis of militarism is therefore flatly contradicted by the facts. Individuals do lock their doors, have safes, and frequently possess or carry arms. With good reason, too, they rely on the police to protect them from criminals, drunkards, and lunatics. Nothing of the kind is true of intranational territorial units, and therefore the militarist thesis not only collapses, but its opposite becomes apparent.

For this reason the proposal to abolish armaments is an entirely feasible one. If communities as colossal as London, or sub-States as important and independent as Scotland, are ruled by law, but with non-physical sanctions, why should not sovereign territorial units be? Indeed, since with sovereign States law would only concern itself with *inter*-relations, and leave internal affairs to the individual nations, this should be the easier to compass.

Doubts which might be raised in regard to the practicability of international law deprived of a physical sanction, spring from the conditions prevailing in our time. They do not reckon with the fact that if sovereign territorial units were as entirely without armaments as are dependent territorial units, national policies of aggression and domination would be meaningless and non-existent. It would be then in the interest of every State, as now of every intranational territorial unit, that law should be supreme, whilst offences would become as rare and as venial in the case of independent as of dependent territorial units.

I venture to submit, therefore, that it would be eminently practicable to abolish armaments—in connection with the coming peace treaty, say. More than this: I suggest that the alternative plan steers us straight unto the rocks of a world disaster. From the press of all the countries it is manifest that the race for superior armaments will be even keener after than it was before the war, and it is plain that in these circumstances the international agony will become accentuated. The wounds inflicted by the war will be thus kept open, peaceful intercourse and commerce reduced to the lowest point, and the pallid spectre of war hovering before us without intermission.

I would consequently plead with those who yearn for a durable and endurable peace, and who at the same time would remain on the plane of practicability, to recognize the practicability of abolishing armaments altogether, and the impracticability, and even the criminality, of deluding ourselves with vain compromises.

After all, must humanity wait for a second or a third international conflagration before it insists on the essential step of abolishing armaments? Shall the present world war be merely the prelude to a series of world wars, each bloodier than its predecessor?

With an *inter*-national legislature and judiciary established and armaments banished, there is a prospect of a durable and endurable peace—not otherwise. In a future article I hope to be permitted to examine the question of how this double demand could be realized.

A CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL OF PEACE

By CARL W. GROSS

THE greatest factor in any movement is the child, for the child grows while the movement is growing, and the original promoters of the movement die in time, passing on their ideals, principles, virtue, and enthusiasm to the younger generation.

So it is with the peace movement. Continuance of the world peace movement must be imbedded, so to speak, in the child's mind, so that both may grow up together. Of the many ways to accomplish this, probably the indirect method is the best. Why shall not the child learn peace through acquaintance, friendship, and interest in the children of other countries? Where these three qualities exist, understanding is bred, and perfect understanding between two peoples is the inveterate foe of hostility. Our children may not visit the children of other countries, except in rare instances, not even the children of our sister continent; but there is still another means of acquaintance. There is the letter. I propose, therefore, that the letter, which is in itself not only a communicator, but also a great educator, should be used as a distinct educational factor in our schools, teaching spelling, grammar, and coherent thought, as it must, but also bringing the children of two continents together, and teaching them, implicitly, a wider vision of the world they live in, a slight but basic comprehension of its alien peoples, and the healthy tolerance that is the foundation of world peace.

Why should not a child in one of our North American schools communicate through letters with another child in South America? Not only would this be interesting to the two concerned, but in time a friendship between the correspondents would unconsciously grow up and a "neighborly feeling" the effects of which could only be for the best. I do not say that this contact through letter-writing is the cure-all for peace, but I do say that it is part of the cement which is vital to the house of peace and commerce.

In a general manner, then, this international letter-writing would be worked out as follows:

If individual initiative among the teaching profession of this country prove not sufficient to inaugurate this peace plan, let a national bureau be established to obtain the interest of other countries in this plan. The Argentinean or Chilean Government would notify this government that it has, let us say, 500,000 children who wish to correspond with the same number here. The bureau, or some division of the educational department, would then notify the different State, county, and mu-